



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,383	05/25/2001	Jonathan Bye	05222.00115	1595

22907 7590 11/20/2002

BANNER & WITCOFF  
1001 G STREET N W  
SUITE 1100  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

STIMPAK, JOHNNA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/864,383		<b>Applicant(s)</b> BYE, JONATHAN <span style="float: right;">h</span>	
	<b>Examiner</b> Johnna R Stimpak		<b>Art Unit</b> 3623	

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sheet with th correspond nce address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-213 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-213 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>7</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The following is a first Office Action upon examination of application number 09/864383. Claims 1-213 are pending and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

#### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 76 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 76 states it is dependent on claim 1. After studying the dependency of all the claims, Examiner believes this claim should be dependent on claim 75 and “claim 1” in claim 76 is a typographical error. Claim 76 will be addressed as if dependent on claim 75. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 99 is objected to for being a redundant claim. Claim 99 has the same dependency and contains the same limitation as claim 97, and therefore it is a redundant claim. Applicant should either (1) cancel one of the redundant claims, or (2) amend one of the claims to depend from a different base claim such that the dependency does not result in a redundant invention being claimed.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 4, 6, 23, 25, 42, 44, 61, 63, 98, 100, 118, 120, 138, 140, 159, 161, 179, 181, 199, 201** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was

Art Unit: 3623

not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no written description in the specification that explains what the applicant regards as "pre-season and in-season". For instance, are "pre-" and "in-season" performances referring to performance during a calendar time period (e.g., seasonal holidays) or are they referring to the performance related to specific products (e.g., seasonal products such as fruits) or something entirely different? Due to these deficiencies in the specification, the metes and bounds of the claimed invention recited in the above-identified claims could not be determined and therefore are rejected as failing to have adequate written support in the specification.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 4, 6, 23, 25, 42, 44, 61, 63, 98, 100, 118, 120, 138, 140, 159, 161, 179, 181, 199, 201** are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. These claims state that the score is based on "pre-season and in-season performance", but there is no definition in the specification as to that constitutes "pre-season" and "in-season". Consequently, the above-identified claims are found to be vague and indefinite.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3623

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1- 3, 5, 7, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19-22, 24, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38-41, 43, 48, 51, 52, 54, 55, 57-60, 62, 67, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 93-97, 99, 104, 107, 108, 110, 111, 113-117, 119, 124, 127, 128, 130, 131, 133-137, 139, 144, 147, 148, 150, 151, 153-158, 160, 162, 165, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174-178, 180, 185, 188, 189, 191, 192, 194-198, 200, 205, 208, 209, 211, 212** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Aycock et al, U.S. Patent Number 5,765,138**.

As per **claim 1**, Aycock et al teaches a method of evaluating the supply base of a supply chain comprising the steps of: inputting data concerning at least one of multiple suppliers in said supply chain (column 3, lines 3-5); displaying performance indicators relating to the performance of said at least one supplier with regard to other entities in said supply chain (column 4, lines 2-6; column 9, lines 37-44); and producing an evaluation score for said at least one supplier based on said inputted data (column 3, lines 3-12).

As per **claim 2**, Aycock et al teaches the performance indicators displayed in said displaying step comprise at least one of: returns, damaged returns, group sales, net sales, buying margin, achieved margin, lateness of order, and service level (column 3, lines 9-13 – the calculation performed refers to the serviceability of the vendor).

As per **claim 3**, Aycock et al teaches the evaluation score is based on deliveries, quality, documentation, culture, and communication (column 3, lines 9-13 – the calculation performed refers to distribution and quality).

As per **claim 4**, teaches the evaluation score is based on pre-season and in-season deliveries.

Art Unit: 3623

As per **claim 5**, Aycock et al teaches the evaluation score is based upon deliveries, quality, documentation, culture, and communication (column 3, lines 9-13 – the calculation performed refers to distribution and quality).

As per claim 6, teaches the evaluation score is based on pre-season and in-season performance.

As per **claim 7**, Aycock et al teaches the evaluation comprising the further step of comparing evaluation scores for multiple suppliers (column 10, lines 5-11).

As per **claim 10**, Aycock et al teaches the evaluation comprising the further step of comparing performing indicators for multiple suppliers (column 10, lines 5-7).

As per **claim 13**, Aycock et al teaches the evaluation score is a numeric representation of performance (column 7, lines 3-13).

As per **claim 14**, Aycock et al teaches the numeric representation is on a scale of 1 to 10 (column 7, lines 3-13 – the response schedule identifies 10 possible items, a point is awarded for each item identified in the response).

As per **claim 16**, Aycock et al teaches the step of providing for input of anecdotal information (Column 13, lines 5-12 – the supplier provides responses to questions which are generated in a word processing-based document).

As per **claim 17**, Aycock et al teaches the step of linking the evaluation score to a product type (column 9, line 59 – column 10, line 5).

As per **claim 19**, Aycock et al teaches the step of restricting the inputting step to authorized personnel (column 10, lines 55-67 – upon receiving the proper access code, the supplier can input information).

Art Unit: 3623

As per **claim 20**, it is the computer readable medium having the computer-executable instructions for the method of **claim 1**. Therefore the analysis as applied to claim 1 above is applied to claim 20.

**Claims 21, 22, 24, 29, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 2, 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 above.

As per **claim 39**, it is the computer readable medium having the computer-executable modules/components for the method of **claim 1**. Therefore the analysis as applied to claim 1 above is applied to claim 39.

**Claims 40, 41, 43, 48, 51, 52, 54, 55, 57** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 2, 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 above.

As per **claim 58**, it is the system of the method of **claim 1**. Therefore the analysis as applied to claim 1 above is applied to claim 58.

**Claims 59, 60, 62, 67, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 2, 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 above.

As per **claim 93**, Aycock et al teaches receiving data concerning at least one of a plurality of suppliers (column 3, lines 3-13); receiving a request relating to at least one supplier of a supply chain (column 4, lines 2-6); and generating at least one performance indicator of the at least one supplier with respect to at least one other supplier (column 9, lines 37-44). Hence, the same evaluation as applied to claim 1 above, is applied to claim 93.

**Claims 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 104, 107, 108, 110, 111** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17 above.

Art Unit: 3623

As per **claim 113**, it is the computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of **93**, therefore the analysis as applied to claim 93 above is applied to claim 113.

**Claims 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 124, 127, 128, 130 and 131** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 104, 107, 108, 110, 111 above.

As per **claim 133**, it is the computer readable medium having computer executable modules/components for performing the method of **claim 93**, therefore the analysis as applied to claim 93 above is applied to claim 133.

**Claims 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 144, 147, 148, 150, 151** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 104, 107, 108, 110, 111 above.

As per **claim 153**, the recited steps of "logging into a system" constitutes the same limitation as addressed in claim 19 which recites providing "restricted access". Furthermore, claim 19 depends from claim 1 which recites the steps that are equivalent to the steps recited in claim 153. Therefore the analysis as applied to claims 1 and 19 is applied to claim 153.

As per **claim 154**, Aycock teaches the performance information includes at least one of actual evaluations, supplier information, teams view evaluations and bulletin board data (column 10, lines 55-67 – once the system is accessed, one can access databases of the supplier evaluation system to receive information on performance reports or product updates).

**Claims 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162, 165, 168, 169, 171, 172** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 13, 14, 16, 17 above.



Art Unit: 3623

As per **claim 174**, it is the computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps of claim 153. Therefore the analysis as applied to claim 153 is applied to claim 174.

**Claims 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 185, 188, 189, 191, 192** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162, 165, 168, 169, 171, 172 above.

As per **claim 194**, it is the computer readable medium having computer executable modules/components for performing **claim 153**. Therefore the analysis as applied to claim 153 above is applied to claim 194.

**Claims 195, 196, 197, 198, 200, 205, 208, 209, 211, 212** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 162, 165, 168, 169, 171, 172 above.

7. **Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 26-28, 30, 31, 34, 37, 39, 45-47, 49, 50, 53, 56, 58, 64-69, 72, 75, 93, 94, 96, 101-103, 105, 106, 109, 112-114, 116, 121-123, 125, 126, 129, 132-134, 136, 141-143, 145, 146, 149, 152**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Gilmore, Jr. U.S. Patent No. 6,008,817**.

As per **claim 1**, Gilmore, Jr. teaches a method of evaluating the supply base of a supply chain comprising the steps of: inputting data concerning at least one of multiple suppliers in said supply chain (column 3, lines 35-36); displaying performance indicators relating to the performance of said at least one supplier with regard to other entities in said supply chain (column 3, lines 44-46); and producing an evaluation score for said at least one supplier based on said inputted data (column 3, lines 41-43).

Art Unit: 3623

As per **claim 2**, Gilmore, Jr. teaches the performance indicators displayed in said displaying step comprise at least one of: returns, damaged returns, group sales, net sales, buying margin, achieved margin, lateness of order, and service level (column 7, lines 4-9 – performance indicator such as maintenance expenses (service level) is one of the components used to evaluate automobile suppliers).

As per **claim 7**, Gilmore, Jr. teaches the evaluation comprising the further step of comparing evaluation scores for multiple suppliers (column 7, lines 26-32).

As per **claim 8**, teaches the comparison in tabular form (column 3, lines 6-10).

As per **claim 9**, teaches the comparison in graphical form (column 3, lines 44-46).

As per **claim 11**, teaches the performance indicators are displayed in tabular form (column 3, lines 6-10).

As per **claim 12**, teaches the performance indicators are displayed in graphical form (column 3, lines 44-46).

As per **claim 15**, teaches the evaluation score is represented in a scale of colors indicating the overall rating of the supplier (column 7, lines 26-32).

As per **claim 18**, teaches the step of ranking multiple ones of the suppliers by the evaluation scores (column 7, lines 49-54).

As per **claim 20**, it is the computer readable medium having the computer-executable instructions for the method of **claim 1**. Therefore the analysis as applied to claim 1 above is applied to claim 20.

**Claims 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34 and 37** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15 and 18 above.

Art Unit: 3623

As per **claim 39**, it is the computer readable medium having the computer-executable module/component for the method of **claim 1**. Therefore the analysis as applied to claim 1 above is applied to claim 39.

**Claims 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 53, 56** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15 and 18 above.

As per **claim 58**, it is the system of the method of **claim 1**. Therefore the analysis as applied to claim 1 above is applied to claim 58.

**Claims 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 75** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15 and 18 above.

As per **claims 93**, Aycock et al teaches receiving data concerning at least one of a plurality of suppliers (column 3, lines 3-13); receiving a request relating to at least one supplier of a supply chain (column 4, lines 2-6); and generating at least one performance indicator of the at least one supplier with respect to at least one other supplier (column 9, lines 37-44). Hence, the same evaluation as applied to claim 1 above, is applied to claim 93.

**Claims 94, 96, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 109, 112** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15 and 18 above.

As per **claim 113**, it is the computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of **claim 93**. Therefore the analysis as applied to claim 93 above is applied to claims 113.

**Claims 114, 116, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 129, 132** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 94, 96, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 109, 112 above.

As per **claim 133**, it is the computer readable medium having computer executable modules/components for performing the method of **claim 93**. Therefore the analysis as applied to claim 93 above is applied to claim 133.

**Claims 134, 136, 141, 142, 143, 145, 146, 149, 152** receive the same analysis as applied to claims 94, 96, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 109, 112 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 163, 164, 166, 167, 170, 173, 183, 184, 186, 187, 190, 193, 203, 204, 206, 207, 210 and 213** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Aycock et al**, U.S. Patent No. 5,765,138 in view of **Gilmore, Jr.** U.S. Patent No. 6,008,817.

As per **claims 163, 164, 166, 167, 170, 183, 184, 186, 187, 190, 203, 204, 206, 207 and 210** Aycock et al teaches all the limitations of these claims as applied to their respective base claims as discussed above, but does not explicitly teach the display of information in tabular form, graphical form or on a scale of colors indicating rating. Gilmore, Jr. teaches the display of information in tabular form (column 3, lines 6-10), graphical form (column 3, lines 44-46) and by color (column 7, lines 26-32). It is old and well known in the art that information can be displayed in three forms, text, tabular or graphical. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to display the performance information of Aycock et al as the

Art Unit: 3623

performance information is displayed in Gilmore, Jr. The motivation would be to compile performance data and show the data in a simplified, apparent way, such as tables, graphs or color scale.

As per **claims 173, 193 and 213**, Aycock et al teaches all the limitations of claims 173, 193 and 213 as applied to their respective base claims as discussed above, but does not specifically teach ranking multiple suppliers by score. Gilmore, Jr. teaches the step of ranking multiple ones of the suppliers by the evaluation scores (column 7, lines 49-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ranking of Gilmore, Jr. in the performance evaluation of Aycock et al. The motivation would be to present the performance data in a well organized manner, which would make the task of selecting the best supplier much simpler.

**10. Claims 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91 and 92** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Aycock et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,765,138** in view of **James et al.**

As per **claims 77, 81, 85 and 89**, Aycock et al. teaches all the limitations of these claims as applied to claims 1, 20, 39 and 58 above. Aycock et al does not teach providing a bulletin board so users can communicate to assess and evaluate the supply base. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously old and well known in the art to use electronic bulletin board systems (BBS) to share common information among a group of users. For instance, USENET newgroups have been used for over a decade to provide a common forum to post important messages between the users to share a particular topic. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3623

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include an electronic bulletin board in Aycock since Aycock already teaches sharing information over a computer network and BBS, as it is notoriously well known in the art at the time the invention was made, provides for a simple, mass information dissemination format so users can read and provide immediate feedback on the issue at hand.

As per **claims 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91 and 92**, these are inherent administrative procedures for an electronic bulletin board system. See, for example, James et al reference ("An Exploratory Study of the Perceived Benefits of Electronic Bulletin Board Use and Their Impact on Other Communication Activities") cited herewith.

### *Conclusion*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Martin et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,029,140, a computer system that reports product delivery dates.

Rohbe's Supplier Analysis System – a supplier performance reporting and measurement software.

Urasaki et al, JP 2001297185A – a supply chain evaluation system.

Art Unit: 3623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Johnna Stimpak** whose telephone number is **703-305-4566**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Tariq Hafiz**, can be reached on **703-305-9643**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Receptionist** whose telephone number is **703-308-1113**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

703-305-7687


[Official communications; including  
After Final communications labeled  
"Box AF"]

703-746-3956

[Informal/Draft communications, labeled  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal  
Drive, Arlington, VA, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor.

Js  
Nov 12, 2002

  
KYLE J. CHOI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
Art Unit 3623